DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 106 CS 503 218

AUTHOR Moreno, Jose: And Others
TITLE Communication Style: College Students in the Philippines Compared to Those from Elsewhere.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 11p.: Paper presented at the Meeting of the Communication Association of the Pacific, Philippines Lecture Series (Manila, Philippines, November 14-23, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students: *Communication Research: *Communication Skills: Comparative Analysis: *Cultural Differences: Foreign Countries: Higher Education: *Self Evaluation (Individuals)

ABSTRACT

A total of 2,286 college students in seven countries completed the Communication Style Measure (CSM) in an investigation of the communication styles of groups. The students were enrolled in universities in Australia, China, Japan, Korea, Micronesia, Hawaii, and the Philippines. The CSM is designed to measure subjects' perceptions of themselves as (1) dominant, (2) friendly, (3) attentive, (4) relaxed, (5) contentious, (6) dramatic, (7) animated, (8) open, and (9) impression-leaving. It also measures communicator image. The results indicated that the Filipino students were friendly, dramatic, relaxed, open, animated, impression-leaving and held a good communicator image of themselves. The Hawaiian students were not exceptional in any area compared to the other groups, although they tended to be more apprehensive about speaking. The Chinese were contentious but not overly dominant, dramatic, open, or relaxed. The Koreans appeared to be effective communicators, being dominant, attentive, and relaxed. The Japanese, while open, did not feel themselves to be orally capable, being shy, apprehensive, and reluctant to speak. The Australians saw themselves as good communicators and were more animated than the other groups. The Micronesians had the strongest communicator image of themselves of any of the groups. (FI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jose Mordeno

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED196106

COMMUNICATION STYLE: COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE PHILIPPINES COMPARED TO THOSE FROM ELSEWHERE

by Jose Mordeno, Ronald Cambra and Donald Klopf*

[A paper presented at the Communication Association of the Pacific--Philippines Lecture Series, November 14-23, 1980, Manila.]

Two basic speech behaviors act simultaneously to influence interpersonal interaction. One behavior, what is said, refers to the message and is "the literal, the denotative, the content." The other, how it is said, refers to the way the message is presented and is "the vehicle, the punctuation, the connotative, the style of communication (Norton, Webb and Schroeder, 1979)." In this paper, our concern is with the latter behavior, the style of communicating, a behavior defined as "the way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood (Norton, 1978)."

Each person possesses a particular style of communicating and the style reflects the person's own individual variation of preferred general modes of interpersonal communication. By virtue of frequency, each person's communicative style becomes a discernible tendency to enact certain dimensions of the general modes. For example, one person's tendency may be to be talkative, outgoing and aggressive and, hence, that person tends to dominate most interpersonal interactions. This is his communicative style. Another person may tend to be quiet, reserved, and speaks only when others have spoken. For such a person, this is his speaking style. A person's style of communicating develops into an instinctive way of presenting the self to others (Norton, Webb and Schroeder, 1979).

Research on communicator style has centered for the most part on determining the variables which identify a communicator's style (Norton, 1974; Norton, 1977; Norton, 1978; Miller, 1977; Norton and Miller, 1975) and on how a communicator's style affects other people's perception of the communicator (Norton and Pettegrew, 1977; Norton, Webb and Schroeder, 1979). The research deals with style as characteristic of an individual. The literature to our knowledge contains no studies of style as characteristic of a group, such as a social, national or ethnic group. This paper reports research, exploratory in nature, which studies the communication styles of groups, specifically, groups of university students in Australia, China, Japan, Korea, Micronesia, Hawaii and the Philippines.

Method

Two thousand tw, hundred eighty-six student representing the seven groups voluntarily completed the Communication Style Measure (CSM) during

---

*Mordeno is Director, Speechpower, Manila; Cambra, Assistant Professor and Klopf, Professor, University of Hawaii.

CS 503 218

regular class sessions. The 265 Australian students were from Armidale School of Advanced Education, the 91 Chinese students were from the Peking Institute of Foreign Languages, the 731 Japanese from Tokyo's Nihon, Meiji, Chuo and Otsuma Women's universities, the 202 Koreans from Seoul's Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, the 264 Micronesians from the University of Guam, the 530 Hawaiians from Honolulu's University of Hawaii, and the 203 Filipinos from Speechpower in Manila.

The CSM was initially developed by Mortensen (1972) and Mortensen, Norton and Arnston (1972). The measure was refined by Norton (1974) and Norton and Miller (1975). It appears in several versions and the fifty-one item version reported by Norton (1978) was used in this study.

The fifty-one items are randomly ordered and inquire of a subject if a particular communicative behavior is descriptive of how he perceives his style. A five-point scale is provided for each item and the subject responds by checking the point on each scale most representative of his perception of his behavior.

The following are examples of the content of the fifty-one items:

1. In most social situations I generally speak very frequently.

2. My speech tends to be very picturesque.

3. I am very argumentative.

4. I tend to constantly gesture when I communicate.

5. What I say leaves an impression on people.

Nine independent variables and one dependent variable (communicator image) are embedded in the CSM. Five items define each independent variable and six the dependent one. These are summed to obtain an index score for each variable. The variables are listed next along with an explanation of each as provided by Norton and Pettegrew (1977):

1. Dominant. This attribute refers to the tendency to come on strong in most social situations. A person who takes charge of things when with others is dominant; a person who generally speaks very frequently in social situation is dominant.

2. Friendly. This attribute refers to a person who usually demonstrates kindly interest and good will toward others. This person is seldom hostile towards others and is usually regarded with high esteem by others.

3. Attentive. This attribute refers to how alert a person is as a communicator. An attentive communicator tends to be encouraging to others, listening carefully to what they have to say. Such a person deliberately reacts in such a way that people know that they are being listened to.

4. Relaxed. This attribute refers to how much at ease a communicator appears to be. A person who is not conscious of any nervous mannerisms

in his speech is relaxed; a person who is calm and collected when talking is relaxed; a person whose rhythm or flow of speech is not affected by nervousness is relaxed.

5. Contentious. This attribute refers to a person who constantly quarrels and disputes with others. Such a person may be thought of as belligerent and the cause of much interpersonal unrest.

6. Dramatic. This attribute refers to how verbally alive a person is. A person whose speech tends to be very picturesque is dramatic; a person who frequently exaggerates to emphasize a point is dramatic; a person who vocally acts out what is being communicated is dramatic.

7. Animated. This attribute refers to how nonverbally active a person is as a communicator. A person who actively uses facial expressions and physical gestures is animated. A person whose eyes tend to reflect a great deal of what they are feeling is animated.

8. Open. This attribute refers to how self-disclosing a person is as a communicator. A person who readily reveals personal things or openly expresses feelings and emotions is an open communicator; when other people generally know the person's emotional state even if the person does not say anything, the person is open.

9. Impression-Leaving. This attribute refers to how affecting a person is as a communicator. What this person says as well as how he says it often leaves an impression. If people react to this person when they first meet and tend to remember him, this person is impression-leaving.

10. Communicator Image. This attribute refers to how good a communicator a person is. If a person finds it easy to talk on a one-to-one basis or in small groups with strangers, he has a good communicator image. A person who finds it easy to maintain a conversation with a member of the opposite sex has a good communicator image.

After the CSM was administered and scored, a comparative analysis of the results was done using the Tuccy t-test Procedure (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975), a test for comparing independent samples of unequal size. The comparisons were between the Philippine's students and the other six groups since the results were to be presented in Manila.

Results

Table 1 presents the comparison of the Filipino CSM scores with the scores of the other six groups. No significant differences appeared between the Filipinos and the Koreans on any of the ten variables. With all of the remaining groups, significant differences appeared on at least several variables and with the Japanese all but one. In terms of the mean scores, the Filipinos had the lowest means on the dominant and attentive variables and had low means on the friendly, relaxed, dramatic, animated, open, impression-leaving and communicator image variables. On the contentious variable, the Filipinos were among those who scored high. The Micronesians fared

Table 1. Philippines Compared to Other Groups on CSM

GROUPS	VARIABLES									
	DOMINANT	FRIENDLY	ATTENTIVE	RELAXED	CONTEN-TIOUS	DRAMATIC	ANIMATED	OPEN	IMPRESSION-LEAVING	COMMUNICATOR IMAGE
PHILIPPINES Compared										
Mean	15.11	13.30	12.13	14.71	15.47	14.98	14.64	15.04	13.28	17.75
Standard Deviation	3.73	3.19	2.75	3.52	3.56	3.38	3.52	3.54	3.25	4.10
TO AUSTRALIA										
Mean	16.69	13.23	13.59	15.38	15.37	14.94	12.86	15.91	14.76	17.35
Standard Deviation	3.49	2.33	2.40	3.31	3.37	3.46	2.99	3.21	2.82	3.54
t Comparison	4.69*	N.S.	6.10*	2.11***	N.S.	N.S.	5.92*	2.77**	5.25*	N.S.
TO CHINA										
Mean	16.85	13.69	14.53	16.05	13.77	16.38	15.31	16.14	14.84	18.93
Standard Deviation	3.17	2.63	2.45	2.76	2.87	2.89	2.60	2.93	2.67	3.34
t Comparison	3.85*	N.S.	7.13*	3.23**	4.00*	3.44**	N.S.	2.30**	3.99*	2.42***
TO HAWAII										
Mean	16.35	13.70	14.24	17.31	15.16	15.47	13.83	15.53	14.12	17.79
Standard Deviation	3.15	2.22	2.25	2.72	3.14	2.82	2.80	3.23	2.32	3.14
t Comparison	4.52*	N.S.	10.63*	10.65*	N.S.	1.98**	3.25**	10.44*	3.87*	N.S.
TO JAPAN										
Mean	16.47	13.93	15.17	15.60	16.22	14.97	15.40	14.53	15.53	20.62
Standard Deviation	3.01	2.43	2.45	2.78	2.96	3.00	2.81	3.03	2.55	3.65
t Comparison	5.36*	3.04**	15.22*	3.81*	3.02**	N.S.	3.19*	2.08***	12.31*	9.62*
TO KOREA										
Mean	15.13	13.28	12.15	14.70	15.52	14.99	14.61	15.08	13.30	17.76
Standard Deviation	3.74	3.17	2.75	3.51	3.48	3.39	3.51	3.55	3.25	4.12
t Comparison	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
TO MICRONESIA										
Mean	16.01	12.83	13.02	16.24	15.08	14.48	12.89	15.23	13.19	16.36
Standard Deviation	3.52	2.74	2.75	3.10	3.54	3.31	3.03	3.18	2.95	3.91
t Comparison	2.64**	N.S.	3.44**	4.99*	N.S.	N.S.	5.76*	N.S.	N.S.	3.72*

*$p < .001$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .05$

the best on low mean scores, scoring lowest on the friendly, dramatic, impression-leaving and communicator image variables. The Koreans had the lowest mean score on the relaxed variable; the Japanese on the open variable; the Chinese on the contentious variable; and the Australians on the animated variable.

The highest mean scores were registered by the Japanese on the friendly, attentive, contentious, animated, impression-leaving, and communicator style variables; by the Chinese on the dominant, dramatic and open variables; and by the Hawaiians on the relaxed variable.

On the dependent variable, communicator image, the variable which reflects the mean scores of the nine independent variables, the mean scores indicate this rank order for the seven groups: 1. Micronesia, 2. Australia, 3. Philippines. 4. Korea, 5. Hawaii, 6. China, and 7. Japan. The respondents in first ranked group perceive themselves as good communicators while those in the seventh position as comparatively poorer communicators.

Discussion

The Filipinos project a favorable communicator image. With low mean scores on all but the contentious variable, they perceive themselves as able to interact effectively in communication situations and believe they are good communicators. They tend to take charge of social situations, are friendly, relaxed, verbally alive, nonverbally active, openly express feelings and emotions, and leave a favorable impression of themselves. They are not quarrelsome or disputive.

Recent research (Mordeno, Cambra, Klopf, 1980) supports the Filipino response on the relaxed variable. A person who is not nervous when speaking, who is calm and collected, is relaxed and is not apprehensive about talking to others. The previous research reveals that Filipinos have little fear of speaking to other people.

The Filipinos, according to other research (Golis, 1979), value getting along with others and desire harmony in interpersonal relations. This finding supports the high score on the contentious variable--Filipinos are not aggressive in oral encounters but cooperative, desiring to get along well with others.

The Australians consider themselves to be worthy communicators, scoring low on the important communicator image variable. They perceive themselves to be very animated when they speak, being nonverbally active, gesturing frequently and expressing their feelings facially. They are friendly, relaxed, attentive, dramatic, open and impression-leaving, and can take charge of oral encounters.

The Micronesians also project a positive communicator image. As a group, they seem to find it easy to talk with others. They perceive themselves to be friendly, dramatic, animated and impression-leaving. They appear to themselves as being interested in others, generally demonstrating goodwill in communication situations. Their speaking they believe is

picturesque and tending toward the exaggerated, especially in nonverbal expressions. They feel they are very active nonverbally. People will remember the typical Micronesian, they feel, after engaging one in conversation.

The Koreans have to be included among those who leave a favorable impression after talking with someone. But they demonstrate other qualities that suggest communicative competence according to their perception of their speaking behavior. They believe they interact in such a way that they take charge of a conversation, come on strong, and talk frequently. They listen carefully and are at ease in speaking situations. The literature supports their perceptions. Research pictures the Koreans as out-going, talkative people. They are seen as active, aggressive, pleasant, friendly, fast, easy to understand, stimulating and conspicuous (Ishii, Klopf and Cambra, 1979).

The Chinese believe themselves to be more contentious than the students representing the other groups. They see themselves as argumentative, quick to challenge those with whom they disagree, and often getting would up in heated discussions. Yet, compared to the others, they are not overly dominant, dramatic, animated, and open nor are they relaxed. The literature contains support for those conclusions. On the matter of being contentious, reports indicate that the Chinese living in certain provinces are quarrelsome and belligerent. However, other research offers contrary arguments, contending that in disputes the Chinese are never extreme with expressions of animosity or anger. Presumably, therefore, the Chinese can be argumentative yet not angry at those they argue with. On the matter of dominance, the Chinese do not come on strong in social situations nor do they take charge. In the People's Republic, the people are subserviant to the group of which they are members and are controlled by the group, even though each person is an active member of the group. The people do not try to control but each has his say in group proceedings. The results also show the Chinese not to be dramatic and open. This may be because the Chinese are said to lack feelings of intimacy with others. Expressions of inner feelings are absent. Animosity and anger are not present and there is little emotional closeness. Society inhibits the expression of affection and feeling (Alter, Klopf and Cambra, 1980).

The Japanese rate themselves most strongly on the open variable. They believe they are honest, sincere and authentic in their oral interactions--all qualities of socially desirable behavior. Yet they rank last on the friendly, attentive, contentious, animated, impression-leaving and communicator image variables--a ranking which implies that they do not hold a positive attitude toward their speaking effectiveness. Previous research bears out their response. The Japanese tend to be apprehensive in oral communication situations and are reluctant to verbalize (Ishii, Klopf and Cambra, 1979). In Japan, there are many sayings describing the importance of silence and disadvantages of speaking. However, there are few words praising good oral behavior. People have been taught that speaking is disadvantageous in getting along in society and the typical Japanese tries to avoid speaking out, especially in a formal setting (Okuda, 1975).

The Hawaiians, apparently think of themselves as middle-of-the-roaders.

At least this study shows them to be. Ranking fifth on the communicator image variable, they rank approximately the same on all but one of the other variables as well, the exception being the relaxed one where they are last. They visualize themselves as being ill-at-ease in speaking situations, a conclusion well supported by other studies. They are much more apprehensive than their fellow American students about communicating orally (Cambra and Klopf, 1979) and more so than students in Australia and Korea (Klopf and Cambra, 1979). Only the Japanese appear more apprehensive.

Caveats are in order about the results. The first of these relate to the CSM. Like other psychometric instruments, the CSM is contingent about context, situations and time. People usually communicate differently in different contexts. For example, a person's speaking style probably will vary if that person is in a therapeutic, academic, religious, business or political context. Likewise, style will vary if the situation is loving, hating, playing, selling, lying, persuading, instructing, asserting, and so on. And, the time of day or the time of life may be a factor. More relaxed earlier in the day, a person, for instance, may be less contentious than he might be after a hard day's work. And, as a person gets older, his communication style is likely to change (Norton and Pettegrew, 1977).

The CSM's validity is not complete at this time, Norton (1978) claims, and judging the results of the variables, especially the friendly one, should be done with caution, he writes. Moreover, the CSM apparently provides the most reliable data when it is employed by a neutral observer who uses it to predict the communication styles of those he observes.

Second, this research probably presents methodological problems and these need to be considered when interpreting the results. Such a problem could exist in the language of the CSM. Whether the CSM is linguistically and conceptually equivalent to each group is not known. It is plausible that an unknown portion of the results are attributable to variations in meaning the CSM might carry among the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans and Filipinos, and even among the Americans represented by the multiethnic Micronesians and Hawaiians. Other methodological problems range from the difficulty of comparing people with different homogeneous backgrounds to the variations in the group's size.

In view of these caveats, further research is necessary to insure that the problems enumerated here have not contaminated the results. In spite of the fact that the results are supported to a large extent by other research, caution should be employed in generalizing about the results.

Summary

Every person has a particular style of communication, that is, a way of communicating. Posture, gesture, facial expression, voice inflection, the sequence of ideas, rhythm and other speaking cues and tendencies tend to define the style. A person's style is a pervasive part of his behavior and affects his interactions with other persons. Whether groups of people, social, ethnic or national groups, similarly have a distinctive style is not known. This study attempted to discover if groups of students from

Australia, China, Micronesia, Hawaii, Japan, Korea and the Philippines are characterized stylistically in some manner.

The results suggest that the Filipino students are friendly, dramatic, relaxed, open, animated, impression-leaving and hold a good communicator image of themselves. The Hawaiians are middle-grounders, not exceptional in any area compared to the others although they tend to be more apprehensive about speaking. The Chinese are contentious but not overly dominant, dramatic, open or relaxed. The Koreans appear to be effective communicators, being dominant, attentive, and relaxed, qualities implying communicative competence. The Japanese, while open, do not feel they are very orally capable, being shy, apprehensive, and reluctant to verbalize. The Australians believe they are good communicators and more animated than the other groups. The Micronesians have the strongest communicator image of the seven populations and consider themselves friendly, dramatic, and impression-leaving.

REFERENCES

Jason Alter, Donald Klopf and Ronald Cambra, "Data on the Oral Communication Practices of the Chinese," a paper presented at the Communication Association of the Pacific--Japan conference, Kobe, 1980.

Ronald Cambra and Donald Klopf, "Further Investigations of Communication Apprehension in Hawaii," Communication, 8 (August, 1979), 44-51.

Satoshi Ishii, Donald Klopf and Ronald Cambra, "Oral Communication Apprehension Among Students in Japan, Korea and the United States," Current English Studies, 18 (September, 1979), 12-26.

Donald Klopf and Ronald Cambra, "Communication Apprehension Among College Students in America, Australia, Japan and Korea," Journal of Psychology, 102, 1979, 27-31.

Larry Miller, "Dyadic Perception of Communicator Style," Communication Research, 4 (January, 1977), 87-112.

Jose Mordeno, Ronald Cambra and Donald Klopf, "Communication Apprehension: Its Incidence in the Philippines and Elsewhere," a paper prepared for the Communication Association of the Pacific--Philippines Lecture Series, November 23, 1980, Manila.

C. David Mortensen, "A Report on the Construct of Speech Intensity," a Speech Communication Association convention paper, Chicago, 1972.

C. David Mortensen, Robert Norton and Paul Arnston, Developing a Measure of Communication Intensity, unpublished research, University of Wisconsin, 1972.

N. H. Nie, C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner and D. H. Bent, SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, 1975).

Robert Norton, "Communicator Style and Teacher Effectiveness," in B. Ruben (ed.) Communication Yearbook I (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, Inc., 1977).

Robert Norton, "Components of Communicator Style," Speech Communication Association convention paper, Chicago, 1974.

Robert Norton, "Foundation of Communicator Style Construct," Human Communication Research, 4 (Winter, 1978), 1974.

Robert Norton, Joyce Webb and A. B. Schroeder, "Communicator Style as a Predictor of Effectiveness and Attractiveness: A Developmental Study," Communication, 8 (August, 1979), 9-25.

Robert Norton and Larry Miller, "Dyadic Perception of Communicator Style," Communication Research, 2 (March, 1975), 50-67.

Robert Norton and Lloyd Pettegrew, "Communicator Style as an Effect Determinant of Attraction," Communication Research, 4 (July, 1977), 257-282.

Kiyoshi Okuda, "Efficacy of Speaking," unpublished paper, International Christian University, 1975.

Angela Golis, "An Exploratory Study of Perceived Values Among Filipinos in Hawaii," Speech Education, 7, 1, (September, 1979), 116-122.